Institute for Global Environmental Strategies

Climate Change Group



Session 3: Institutionalization towards Low-Carbon Green Growth Framing Presentation

Koji Fukuda

Policy Researcher, Climate Change Group

Kentaro Tamura, PhD

Group Deputy Director, Climate Change Group

Background and Objective

Background

- No clear definition of Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Actions (NAMAs)
- Flexibility over definition/scope of NAMAs according to developing countries' national circumstances
- Developing countries are encouraged to submit NAMAs to UNFCCC
- NAMAs provides an opportunity to set countries on a pathway to low-carbon development/green growth

Challenge

- Many of ASEAN countries have not submitted NAMAs yet, and still under formulation stage
- Those submitted NAMAs (Indonesia, Singapore, Cambodia) are in process of making implementation plans

• This Session's Objective

- Address the issues related to national institutional arrangement for realizing low-carbon green growth by exploring
- 1) mainstreaming climate change mitigation into national development plans/strategies
- 2) ways to streamline **institutional congestion** among seemingly related mitigation initiatives in Asian countries

Essential Elements for NAMA Formulation: Three Dimensions

NAMAs should be formulated on national consensus, and linked to national development priorities.

- NAMAs need to be based a good understanding of the current and future emissions trends and cost implications.
 - → Technical dimension
- NAMAs need to be embedded in national priorities.
 - → Mainstreaming dimension
- NAMAs need to be formulated through a cross-ministerial decision-making process which can coordinate and reconcile diverse interests.
 - > Institutional dimension

Essential Elements of Formulating a NAMA: Three Dimensions

Technical Dimension

- ✓ GHG inventory and measurement rules
- √ Future GHG emission trend
- ✓ Potential mitigation options and their cost estimation

Understanding of current/future emission status and cost implication

Mainstreaming Dimension

- ✓ Climate Change agenda mainstreamed into national development plans and priorities
- ✓ Priority sectors and measures /options
- ✓ Action plans/strategy with operational details (actions, costs, actors, durations, expected impacts, etc)

Priority setting for mitigation options in the context of national development

Institutional Dimension

- ✓ National decisionmaking process on CC established (i.e. interministerial council)
- ✓ Existing institutional arrangements for mitigation efforts
- ✓ Task allocations on NAMAs among stakeholders
 (i.e. ministries, sectors, international donors)

Foundation for national decision making for NAMAs

National consensus on NAMAs

Technical Dimension

	Cambodia	Lao PDR	Viet Nam	Indonesia	Thailand
GHG inventory, measurement rules	• First National Communication 2002 (INC)	•INC 2000	•INC 2003, Second National Commination (SNC) 2010	INC 1999, SNC 2011/12Legal base for inventory	•FNC 2000, SNC 2011 •T-VER scheme (2013)
Future GHG emission projection	•2020 projection (INC)	•No reference in INC	•SNC	Sector-based projection,2020 BAU (SNC)	No projection (SNC)Sector-based projections
Potential mitigation options & their cost estimation	 Mitigation potential estimate in key sectors No reference to cost 	•No reference in INC	 28 mitigation options in 3 sectors & their cost estimates (SNC) MAC (DNDC) 	 Mitigation options in 6 sectors, some of which have cost estimation 	 Renewable

- Different levels of in-house technical capacity across countries
 - →Room for further improving technical capacity to capture GHG emission trends with BAU estimates, mitigation potentials, costs → Sense of ownership on NAMAs
- Remaining challenges over data collection, data sharing across different ministries
 - → Existing efforts: institutional arrangement for inventories (Indonesia), voluntary emission reduction schemes with robust accounting rules (Thailand, Indonesia)

Mainstreaming Dimension

	Cambodia	Lao PDR	Viet Nam	Indonesia	Thailand
Mainstrea m-ing mitigation	 National Develop- ment Strategies and Plans 2009-2013 (NDSP) 	• 7 th National Socio- Economic Development Plan (NEDP7)	 Schedule and leading agency (National Target Program to Respond to Climate Change: NTPRCC 2008) National Climate Change Strategy (NCCS 2010) 	 Mid-term National Development Plan (RPJM 2010-2014) Indonesia Climate Change Sectoral Roadmap (ICCSR) 	 National Master Plan for Climate Change (draft) National Economic and Social Development Plan (NESDP)
Identifica- tion of priority sectors and policies	Priority actions (NDSP)	• Five sectors (National Strategy on Climate Change 2010)	•Six sectors (NCCS)	 National Action Plan for GHG Emissions Reduction (RAN-GRK) ICCSR 	•6 Strategies (National Climate Change Strategic Plan NCCSP)
Action plan /strategy	Cambodian Climate Change Strategic Plan (draft)	 National Action Plan for Climate Change (draft) 	 Action Plans by line ministries, and local governments 	 RAN-GRK, Local action plan on GHG emission reduction (RAD- GRK) underway 	•REDP, Energy Conservation Plan

- Progress in mainstreaming process observed in all five countries
 - → Difference in leading agencies for mainstreaming: developmental planning agency vs environmental ministry
- Efforts to ensure NAMA's contribution to SD by using existing sectoral policies and programmes (EE, RE, forestry, agriculture) as a starting point

Institutional Dimension

	Cambodia	Lao PDR	Viet Nam	Indonesia	Thailand	
National decision-making process	National Climate Change Committee	National Steering Committee on Climate Change	National Climate Change Committee	 National Council on Climate Change (DNPI) 	 National Climate Change Committee 	
Existing institutional arrangements for mitigation efforts	REDD+Green growth strategy	_	 Various sectoral initiatives REDD+ Green growth strategy 	Various sectoral and local initiatives	 NCCSP REDP Energy Efficiency Plan BKK's low carbon action plan 	
Task allocations on NAMAs formulation	 MOE seeks playing a coordination role 	_	 MONRE taking a coordination role 	 BAPENAS taking a coordination role 	 Thai Greenhouse gas Organization playing a coordination role 	

- Establishment of cross-ministerial decision-making process in all five countries
 - → Further analysis needed to examine how they actually work
- Observed institutional congestion among NAMA-related initiatives
 - → REDD+, green growth strategies/RM
- Limited capacity of coordinating bodies (esp. MOE/MONRE); various sectoral initiatives

Framing Questions: Mainstreaming

- Common perception over the importance of mainstreaming, but further analysis is needed on
 - →how to enhance actions through further promoting such process
 - →how to reconcile climate change with other competing priorities
 - 1. Updates of mainstreaming: What kind of mainstreaming actions are taken domestically?

2. Role of development/planning ministry:

To what extent do they communicate with line ministries on mainstreaming?

- 3. Role of finance ministry:

 To what extent do they support /
 back up mainstreaming efforts,
 i.e. through appropriate allocation
 of national budgets?
- 4. Challenges / Difficulties:

What are the major challenges for full-fledged mainstreaming? What hinders such process?

Taking stock of Mainstreaming Identifying promoting & hindering factors

Seeking practical approaches for enhancing mainstreaming

Framing Questions: Streamlining

- Emergence of similar initiatives with possible overlaps
 - → NAMAs, LEDS(Low Emission Development Strategies), GG(Green Growth) strategies, national climate change strategy / plans
 - → How to synergize initiatives in a sustainable, less burden-some way to boost low carbon development
 - 1. Existing efforts for coordination:
 Any observed coordination
 efforts? To what extent such
 efforts are successful?
- 2. Challenges / Difficulties:
 What are the key challenges for realizing such coordination / streamlining efforts?

- 3. Donor's effort for harmonization: How do donors attempt to harmonize their initiatives?
- 4. Possible Role of Research Community: What should be the roles for research communities & international networks to best support addressing streamlining?

Taking stock of institutional congestion

Recognizing existing efforts for coordination

Seeking approaches for addressing institutional congestion